UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/526,802	03/07/2005	Yasuhiro Omori	JFE-05-1039	7406	
	7590 03/25/200 DLA PIPER US LLP	EXAMINER			
ONE LIBERTY			YANG, JIE		
1650 MARKET ST, SUITE 4900 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/25/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/526,802	OMORI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JIE YANG	1793		

	JIE YANG	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affida eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	of Appeal. To avoid abar avit, or other evidence, w e with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the status of the status of t	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set for ster than SIX MONTHS from the mail b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TI).	ing date of the final rejectio	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amou hortened statutory period for reply or than three months after the mailing o	nt of the fee. The appropriation in the final Office.	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brid	of will make a sectional ba	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed) 	nsideration and/or search (see Now);	OTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	er form for appeal by materially i	educing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally r	eiected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally is	ejected ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-C	Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(1	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		will be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under app and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fails See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Roy King/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793	JY		

Applicant's arguments filed on 03/10/2008 with respect to claims 1-3 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are summarized as follows:

- 1, Matsuzaki teaches a content of less than 0.05wt% Si and provides no motivation to modify that amount. Matsuzaki does not teach the specific recoted amount of Cr, Cu, and Ni.
- 2, Isokawa does not teach claimed more than 5 to 30% bainite phase, Isokawa does not teach the claimed composition (Mo, Ti, and B), claims 1-3 are not obvious over Matsuzaki in further view of Isokawa.

Responses are as follows:

Regarding the argument 1, as pointed out in theprevious office action marked 12/06/2007, Matsuzaki teaches the alloy with all the composition ranges overlapping the composition ranges of claimed alloy except Si. However, the 0.05wt%Si of Matsuzaki's alloy is close to the claimed 0.051wt% (i.e. more than 0.05wt%), which have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05 I. Regarding the argument 2, applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Matsuzaki in further view of Isokawa teaches the alloy with composition range overlapping the composition range of claimed alloy, which have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05. The motivation for combining Matsuzaki and Isokawa please refer to the office action marked 12/06/2007.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jie Yang whose telephone number is 571-2701884. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-2721244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JΥ